

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 17, 19-20, 23, 45, and 47 were pending in the application. Claim 17, 20, and 23 have been amended, claims 45 and 47 have been cancelled while no claims have been added. Therefore, claims 17, 19-20, and 23 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

It should be noted that claim 23 has been amended to correct a typographical error and not for reasons related to patentability.

PRIOR ART REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 103

In the office action, claims 17-21, 23, and 45-47 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(c??) as being anticipated by the publication titled *Virtual Network Computing* to Richardson *et al.* (hereafter “Richardson”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to the pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 17 recites a remote computing server system for efficiently transmitting display elements (generated by a plurality of programs on the server) on a compressed video stream. An analysis module compares the original display elements of the programs with a *common* set of predefined display elements stored at the server, wherein responsive to transmission bandwidth limitations that are identified by the server, the analysis module selects corresponding modified display elements from the set of predefined display elements that are most similar to one or more of the original display elements for each of the plurality of programs.

Independent claim 17 further recites “a server that generates a set of predefined display elements of a user interface and stores the set in a table in compressed form, wherein the stored predefined display elements comprise display elements of three or more types of display elements from a group consisting of background, menu, button,

icon or font display elements, wherein the a server, executes a plurality of programs, each of which generates a set of display commands which represent original display elements of a user interface for each of said plurality of programs, **wherein the set of predefined display elements are common display elements that are used by two or more of the plurality of programs**; and an analysis module for comparing the original display elements of each of the plurality of programs with the set of predefined display elements stored at the server....”

At least these recited features are not disclosed or taught by the applied references.

Specifically, Richardson discloses a virtual network computing (VNC) server that allows a single desktop to be accessed by multiple clients. (Richardson, page 33, ¶ 2). The VNC server uses various encoding schemes for drawing user interface components. The VNC server selects an appropriate encoding scheme according to the capabilities of the server and client and the network connection between them. (Richardson, page 35, ¶ 6). However, Richardson does not disclose “predefined display elements of a user interface and for storing the set in a table in compressed form” nor “three or more types of display elements comprising background, button, menu or font display elements” stored in compressed form, **wherein the set of predefined display elements are common display elements that are used by two or more of the plurality of programs**.

In particular, the office action essentially recognizes the difference between the disclosed features and Richardson but then states that “the examiner interprets these windows, backgrounds, and text characters to be a set of predefined display elements of a user interface stored in a table in compressed form (frame buffer frame)” See pages 3-4 of the Office Action. However, even this interpretation clearly does not disclose that the claimed set of predefined display elements are common display elements that are used by two or more of the plurality of programs that transmit display elements (generated by the plurality of programs on the server) on a compressed video stream. Rather, as noted in the office action, Richardson only discloses “reusing windows, backgrounds, and text characters from *previous* update for the current update by modifying for use by the *current* update....” (emphasis added). Clearly, this only discloses that previous

displayed elements of a program are used to update subsequent display elements for that same program and thus this disclosure is very different from the claimed use of a *common* set of predefined display elements that used by two or more of the plurality of programs that transmit respective display elements on a compressed video stream.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, (Fed. Cir. 1989). *See* MPEP §2131. Therefore, in order for a reference to be utilized as an anticipatory reference under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must disclose each and every claimed element. This is certainly not the case here, and thus the Sec. 102 rejection as to claim 17 must be withdrawn.

Therefore, none of the specific features recited in the pending amended independent claim 20 are disclosed by the applied references in this application. In addition, these features are not just a random agglomeration of features but provide for synergies when a remote computing server system with a server that provides remote client access to a plurality of programs that are run at the server, remotely from one or more client systems, and in which the server converts display commands generated from the plurality of programs into compressed video streams. Neither the specific features nor its synergies is taught or suggested by the applied references. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the pending independent claims are in condition for allowance over the art of record.

Independent claim 20 is also patentable for reasons that are similar to that discussed above with respect to independent claim 17. .

Specifically, **independent claim 20** recites, *inter alia*, "generating, at a server computer, a set of predefined display elements of a user interface and storing the set in a table in compressed form, wherein the stored predefined display elements comprise display elements of three or more types from a group consisting of background, menu, button, icon or font display elements; executing, at the server computer, a plurality of

programs, each of said programs generating a set of display commands... the set of display commands representing original display elements of a user interface for the Internet connection, **wherein the set of predefined display elements are common display elements that are used by two or more of the plurality of programs...**” As discussed earlier herein with respect to claim 17, these recited features are not disclosed or suggested by the applied reference or the other previously cited art. Accordingly, independent claim 20 is patentable over the cited references.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a whole.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: April 2, 2008

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/

Aaron C. Chatterjee
Reg. No. 41,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 706-7453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION **(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

April 2, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/770769
Attorney Docket Number: 150824.02
Filing Date: 25 January 2001